

Election/Restriction

The Applicants confirm election of claims 1-5 with traverse per a conversation with Examiner on September 26, 2005.

Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 1-5

Applicants provisionally traverse the rejection and will deal with the issue at the time of allowance of the pending claims.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-5

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,472,027). Applicants traverse the rejection and have amended claims 1, 3, 4 and have cancelled claim 2. Olson does not teach Applicants triggered response compositions. It does not teach a composition that is triggered to cure by ultraviolet radiation and then is triggered to swell and disperse when in contact with a basic stripping agent allowing it to be removed. Applicants submit the invention as presented herein is patentable over Olson *et al.* of record.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-5

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson *et al.* in view of Lion (JP 07188345A), as applied to claims 1 and 3-5. Applicants traverse the rejection and have amended claims 1, 3, 4 and have cancelled claim 2. Applicants contend the Examiner has not met his burden with regard to the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The UV epoxy acrylate coating cannot be combined with the coating in Lion to obtain Applicants invention. Applicants submits the invention as presented in amended claims 1, 3 and 4, is patentable over the art of record.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues related to this application by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. Stephen E. Johnson
Attorney/Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,916
Telephone: (215) 619-5478
Facsimile: (215) 619-1654

Rohm and Haas Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399
January 5, 2006